

## **REMARKS**

Claims 10-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-9 have been cancelled, without prejudice. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The information disclosure statement filed February 25, 2005 has been placed in the application file. The Office Action indicates that the references referred to therein have not been considered, although the 1449 Form was initialed, which indicates that the references have been considered. In any event, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is filed concurrently herewith that includes copies all of the references previously cited (and an additional reference). Applicants respectfully assert that this Information Disclosure Statement is in full compliance with CFR 1.98 (a)(2). Accordingly, there should be no question that the USPTO has considered (or will consider) each of these references.

## **SPECIFICATION**

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

## **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to because they are said to include black and white photographs. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" anything resembling black and white photographs have been replaced with drawings illustrating the features shown therein. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the replacement sheets submitted herewith are in full compliance with 37 CFR 1.84 (b)(1).

## **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10-11, 13-14 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Allum (U.S. Pat. No. 6,063,046). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allum (U.S. Pat. No. 6,063,046) in view of an obvious design choice. Claims 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allum (U.S. Pat. No. 6,063,046) in view of Orman et al. (U.S. Pat. 4,785,674). Claims 16-17 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allum (U.S. Pat. No. 6,063,046) in view of Girone et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,162,189). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art. For example Claim 10 recites: "a kinetic model analyzer into which an output from each of said rotation angle sensor and said torque measuring mechanism is inputted, and determining a target rotation angle at which the force applied to said plate by said user is in balance with the rotating force of said motor; and a motor controller for

controlling said motor so that said plate is tilted at said target rotation angle determined by said kinetic model analyzer in accordance with a predetermined kinetic model.”

In contrast, none of the cited references, either singly or in combination, disclose a kinetic model analyzer into which an output from each of said rotation angle sensor and a torque measuring mechanism is inputted, and determining a target rotation angle at which the force applied to a plate by a user is in balance with the rotating force of a motor; and a motor controller for controlling the motor so that they plate is tilted at the target rotation angle determined by the kinetic model analyzer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the invention of Claim 10 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art. Since each of the remaining claims depend from independent Claim 10, directly or indirectly, Applicants respectfully assert that they are likewise patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the

Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 26, 2007

By:   
Michael E. Hilton  
Reg. No. 33,509

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MEH/jks